



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/091,827 | 03/06/2002 | Tejaswini Hosali | YOR920010755US1 | 8463 |
| 48103 | 7590 | 06/30/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| SAMUEL A. KASSATLY LAW OFFICE 20690 VIEW OAKS WAY SAN JOSE, CA 95120 | | | DESHPANDE, KALYAN K | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3623 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/091,827 | Applicant(s) HOSALI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Kalyan K. Deshpande | Art Unit 3623 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/6/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. The following is a non-final office action in response to the communications received on March 6, 2002. Claims 1-24 are now pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The examiner has reviewed the patents and articles supplied in the Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) provided on March 6, 2002.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: Each claim should begin with a capital letter and end with a period. Periods may not be used elsewhere in the claims except for abbreviations. See *Fressola v. Manbeck*, 36 USPQ2d 1211 (D.D.C. 1995). See MPEP §608.01(m). Claim 6 fails to end with a period.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11-15, 19-20, 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bacon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6430538).

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 1, Bacon et al. teach:

A method of routing an object through a workflow system, comprising:

parsing the object into portions that are likely to follow different workflow paths (see column 9 lines 1-50 and figure 7; where workflow and workflow activities are defined. Each activity is broken down into subflows and branches.);

examining information and an organizational structure contained in each parsed portion (see column 10 lines 10-54 and figure 7; where the server identifies the next activity based on the business process and the just completed activity and pushes the object to the next necessary destination.); and

based on examined information and organizational structure, determining an appropriate destination for the object at a lowest possible granularity level within the organizational structure (see column 10 lines 10-54 and figure 7; where the server identifies the next activity based on the business process and the just completed activity and pushes the object to the next necessary destination.).

As per claim 2, Bacon et al. teach:

The method of claim 1, further including examining external information, if any, related to each parsed portion, to further determine the lowest possible granularity level of the object destination (see column 4 lines 39-57; where external activities are examined to determine the status of the workflow and the next possible activity.).

As per claim 3, Bacon et al. teach:

The method of claim 2, further including examining a set of business rules, if any, contained in each parsed portion and related to the organizational structure, to

Art Unit: 3623

further determine the lowest possible granularity level of the object destination (see column 9 lines 27-38; where specific rule-based branch conditions can be set to further route objects during workflow.).

As per claim 4, Bacon et al. teach:

The method of claim 3, wherein parsing the object into portions includes parsing the object into subsets of information (see column 9 lines 1-50; where workflow is parsed in to branches and subflows based on activities, object attributes, and data or information contained in the workflow.).

As per claim 8, Bacon et al. teach:

The method of claim 3, wherein the object includes an intermediate document (see column 2 lines 52-60; where the object or work item is a document. The system accounts for the object data type, coordinating the processing of the object data type such that the data type is usable by all subprocesses. An intermediate document is a file set for processing that is of a data type that the system can read, as per Specification page 5).

As per claim 9, Bacon et al. teach:

The method of claim 3, wherein the object includes a transactional document (see column 2 lines 52-60; where the object or work item is a document. The system accounts for the object data type, coordinating the processing of the object data type such that the data type is usable by all subprocesses. A transactional document is a file used that is processed, i.e. used in transactions, by the workflow system.).

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 11, Bacon et al. teach:

The method of claim 3, wherein the set of business rules includes specific routing rules (see column 9 lines 27-38; where specific rule-based branch conditions can be set to further route objects during workflow.).

Claims 12-15, 19-20, and 22 recite "a computer program for routing an object through a workflow system" taught by Bacon et al. (see column 4 lines 39-65 and column 5 lines 23-48; where the workflow system is a computer program). Claims 12-15, 19-20, and 22 further recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 1-4, 8-9, and 11; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

Claims 23 and 24 recite "a system for routing an object through a workflow system" taught by Bacon et al. (see column 4 lines 39-65 and column 5 lines 23-48; where a system for routing activities and tasks is disclosed.). Claims 23 and 24 further recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 1-3; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 5-7, 10, 16-18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6430538).

As per claims 5-7, Bacon does not expressly teach the specific data of “customer information”, “customer credit information”, and “country information”; however, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *MPEP* § 2106. The advantage of capturing this specific data is these data types will enable the proper routing of work items based on specific data. For example, data contained in the country field would enable the routing of that work item to a client user that handles that specific country work items. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to incorporate the specific data of “customer information”, “customer credit information”, and “country information” to the Bacon et al. system in order to ensure the proper routing of work items, which is a goal of Bacon et al. (see column 1 lines 27-45).

As per claim 10, Bacon et al. fail to teach “the organization structure includes an organizational hierarchy”. It is old and well-known in the art for the organization structure to include an organization hierarchy. The advantage of the organization structure including an organization hierarchy is that work items can be properly assigned to the persons and resources with the appropriate skills to perform the work

Art Unit: 3623

item. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of "the organization structure includes an organization hierarchy" to properly assign work items to persons and resources with the necessary skills to perform the work item, which is a goal of Bacon et al. (see column 1 lines 40-45).

Claims 16-18 and 21 recite "a computer program for routing an object through a workflow system" taught by Bacon et al. (see column 4 lines 39-65 and column 5 lines 23-48; where the workflow system is a computer program). Claims 16-18 and 20 further recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 5-7 and 10; therefore the same rejections apply to these claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following are pertinent to the current invention, though not relied upon:

Barry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6615258) teaches an integrated data management system for providing data management services from an enterprise over the Internet is described. A user interface executable in a customer workstation authenticate the customer's access to the system and presents one or more data management services according a customer entitlement, for the customer to select.

Magers et al. (U.S. Patent Publication NO. 20030018490) teach a system, method, and apparatus are provided for simulating real-world logistical systems in a virtual environment. Sets of objects are provided with various properties and methods

Art Unit: 3623

for performing various functions, such as pricing, movement, demand, etc. The objects are sheathed in a framework the enables the objects to operate in a semi-autonomous fashion to create a virtual environment.

Goossens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6356880) teaches methods, devices and systems for assigning a value associated with a manufacturing or service-related transaction to a task within an organizational logical structure includes a step of retrieving attributes of the transaction, such attributes including, for example, an identification of the item, whether the item was procured, the PO number, the category of the item and/or an identification of the sub-inventory, in the case of a material transaction.

Brodersen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6850895) teaches a method, a program product, and a system for assigning resources to tasks in a rule based, resource constrained system.

Leymann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6065009) teaches a WFMS to execute a multitude of process models consisting of a network of potentially distributed activities. Within this structure is the implementation of events within WFMS like any other process activity. Thus events are implemented as event-activities, a special type of an activity within said WFMS. Such an event-activity can manage an event occurring internal or external to the WFMS.

Akifuji et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6853974) teaches a workflow system capable of simultaneously executing a plurality of business processes, an exception handling unit extracts an exception condition from a business status definition table and transfers the

Art Unit: 3623

exception condition to a status watcher, the status watcher refers to data contained in an application data base and, when there is a change meeting a predetermined exception condition, transfers the change to a user retrieval unit, the user retrieval unit refers to a working data base to retrieve a user and gives information to the computer of the related user, whereby, when one of interdependent business processes is discontinued, information that the business process is discontinued is given to the computers executing the other interdependent business processes.

Basu et al. (Basu, Amit; Blanning, Robert W.; "A Formal Approach to Workflow Analysis", *Information Systems Research*, March 2000, pp. 17-36) teaches a method to implement workflow system by process redefinition and reengineering.

Leymann et al. (Leymann, F.; Roller, D.; "Workflow-Based Applications", *IBM Systems Journal*, 1997, pp. 102-123) teaches a method for reconstructing workflow management systems based on new or modified business processes.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalyan K. Deshpande whose telephone number is (571) 272-5880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


kkd


Beth Van Doren
AU 3623